

REMARKS

Status of the Application

Claims 1-5, 15-16, 45, and 48-51 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-5, 15-16, 45, and 48-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 48 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Imai (US Patent 5,930,037) in view of Takahashi et al. (US Patent 4,921,330). Claims 1-3, 15, 45, and 49-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Imai in view of Iwahara et al. (JP 60061738). Claims 2-3 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Imai in view of Iwahara as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Snaper (US Patent 4,140,370). Claims 4, 5, and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Imai in view of Iwahara as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Eichenlaub (US Patent 5,410,345).

By this Amendment, Applicants hereby amend claims 1 and 3-5, and cancel claims 2, 15-16, 45 and 48-51.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 1-5, 15-16, 45, and 48-51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Without conceding to the merits of the Examiner's rejection, Applicants hereby amend claim 1 to address any alleged deficiencies. Withdrawal of the instant rejections are hereby respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 48 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Imai (US Patent 5,930,037) in view of Takahashi et al. (US Patent 4,921,330).

Without conceding to the merits of the Examiner's rejection, Applicants hereby cancel claim 48, rendering the instant rejection moot. Withdrawal of the instant rejection is hereby respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 15, 45, and 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Imai in view of Iwahara et al. (JP 60061738).

Claims 2-3 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Imai in view of Iwahara as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Snaper (US Patent 4,140,370).

Without conceding to the merits of the Examiner's rejections, claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and, therefore, the Examiner's rejection of claim 2 is now moot.

Without conceding to the merits of the Examiner's rejections, Applicants hereby amend claim 1 to incorporate a portion of the subject matter of claim 2. Therefore, amended claim 1 recites, in part, "the adhesive layer affixes the optical unit directly on the image surface of the display panel" and "said adhesive layer is provided along at least one side extending only in a longitudinal direction of said convex lens or the longitudinal direction of said semicylindrical lens in said optical unit." Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's proposed combination of references would not render amended claim 1 obvious.

Imai discloses a stereoscopic display apparatus in which a lenticular lens 103 is in close contact with the display surface of a display device 102 and is fixed to the latter with an adhesive. Iwahara (FIG. 4) discloses that a first sheet 2 and a second sheet 3, both of which have

been deflected in advance for formation, are adhered and fixed to each other by an adhesive tape, whereby stress is applied for constant tight adhesion therebetween. However, neither Imai nor Iwahara disclose that the adhesive fixes the optical unit directly on the image surface of the display panel. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's proposed combination of Imai and Iwahara do not disclose, or fairly suggest, the device recited in claim 1.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that Snaper fails to cure the deficiencies noted in the proposed combination of Imai and Iwahara. Contrary to claim 1, Snaper (column 7, lines 29-33) discloses an optical screen 66, which is attached to a television receiver via an adhesive strip located on two sides of a periphery 70 of a peripheral mask 68 attached to the optical screen 66. On the other hand, claim 1 recites that the optical unit is attached to a display panel via an adhesive layer attached directly to the optical unit. Therefore, Snaper fails to cure the deficiencies noted above with respect to claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the Examiner's proposed combination of references. Independent claim 3 recites features similar to claim 1, and is patentable for reasons analogous thereto.

Claims 4, 5, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Imai in view of Iwahara as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Eichenlaub (US Patent 5,410,345).

Without conceding to the merits of the Examiner's rejections, Applicants hereby write claims 4 and 5 in independent form, and further amend claims 4 and 5 in similar manner to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 4 and 5 are patentable for reasons analogous to claim 1, since Eichenlaub fails to cure the deficiencies noted with respect to claim 1.

Further, Iwahara (FIG. 4) illustrates warping first and second sheets, such that the first sheet is warped more than, and overlaps, the second sheet. The first and second sheets are fixed by an adhesive tape so that the first and second sheets adhere to each other. The adhesive tape is provided at the top and bottom sides of the sheets, as illustrated in FIG. 4, so that the shape of the sheets is not always fixed, when they shrink or expand differently. According to Iwahara, the position where the adhesive tape is provided is determined based on how the sheets are warped.

On the other hand, unlike the sheet of Iwahara, the optical unit recited in claims 4 and 5 is not provided in a warped state. Therefore, no motivations exist which would apply the position of the adhesive tape of Iwahara to the image display devices recited in claims 4 and 5. As described above, the position where the adhesive tape is provided is determined based on how the sheets are warped, while in claims 4 and 5, the disposition of the adhesive layer is determined based on the shape of the optical unit according to claims 4 and 5.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended claims 4 and 5 are patentable over the applied art, as the Examiner's proposed combination of references would not have rendered claims 4 and 5 obvious.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dion R. Ferguson/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Dion R. Ferguson
Registration No. 59,561

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 23, 2010